SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT AND REPORTING

ANALYSIS OF SCHOOL JURISDICTION 2003-2006 EDUCATION PLANS

October 2004

Alberta
LEARNING

ISSN 1492-0824

For further information, contact
System Improvement and Reporting Division
9th Floor, Commerce Place
10155 – 102 Street
Edmonton, Alberta T5J 4L5

Telephone (780) 422-8671
Toll free in Alberta by dialing 310-0000
Fax: (780) 422-8345
Email: Sig@learning.gov.ab.ca
This document is also available on the Alberta Learning website
http://learning.gov.ab.ca

This document is intended primarily for:
System and School Administrators
School Board Trustees
Alberta Learning Executive Team and Managers

And may be of interest to:
Teachers
Parents
Community members

Copyright © 2004, the Crown in Right of Alberta, as represented by the Minister of Learning. Permission is given by the copyright owner to reproduce this document for educational purposes and on a non-profit basis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary i
Introduction 1
Methodology and Limitations 1
Education Plan Requirements 1
Plan Development and Communication Processes 4
Jurisdiction Trends and Issues 7
Jurisdiction Strengths and Challenges 8
Alberta Learning Supports 14
Effective Practices Available for Sharing 15
Effective Practices Wanted 17
Feedback to Alberta Learning 19
Feedback on Revised Review Process 21
Appendix 1 23

List of Tables

Table 1- Percent Including Specific Requirements 2
Table 2- Total Accountability Performance Measures Reported by Jurisdiction 3
Table 3- Process Used to Develop the 3YEP 5
Table 4- People Involved in Developing the 3YEP 5
Table 5- Planned Method of Communicating Jurisdictions' 3YEP 6
Table 6- Primary Trends and Issues 7
Table 7- Provincial Achievement Test/Diploma Exam Results 9
Table 8- Special Education Profile 10
Table 9- Multiple Year High and/or Low Performing Schools 10
Table 10- FNMI Data 11
Table 11- High School Completion Data 12
Table 12- AISI Information 13
Table 13- Desired Alberta Learning (AL) Supports in Education Plan Implementation 14
Table 14- Shared Aspects of Plan that Would Be of Interest to Other Jurisdictions 16
Table 15- Effective Practices Jurisdictions are Interested in Hearing About from Others 17
Table 16- Feedback to Alberta Learning 19
Table 17- Feedback on the Revised 3YEP Process 21

105-02237/

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Alberta Learning analyzes school jurisdiction education plans annually to support continuous improvement in the K-12 learning system, as one way of being informed about key issues identified by school boards as affecting the K-12 education system, and to reinforce the accountability relationship between Ministry and school board planning in support of systemic continuous improvement. This report documents the continuing implementation of an articulated planning model. Key insights based on this report include the following:

1. The alignment of jurisdictions Three-Year Education Plans with Alberta Learning requirements continues to improve. (p.2-3, Table 2).
2. The weak representation of ESL strategies and measures represent a key program area that requires further attention in many jurisdictions' education plans p.2, Table 1).
3. Improving instruction and achievement in mathematics, especially at middle and high school, remains a focal point across jurisdictions (p.9).
4. FNMI student identification is an issue/constraint in the data gathering and evaluation of this priority (p.11).
5. Incorporation of AISI Project results and outcomes in the jurisdictions' accountability planning and reporting is an area that needs further clarification and development (p.13).
6. Jurisdictions showed a great deal of interest in obtaining additional Ministry assistance with various sources of information, resources and research services (p. 14-15, Table 13).
7. As evidenced in Table 14, jurisdiction's education plans are a rich resource for sharing effective practices between jurisdictions.
8. Program implementation and professional development are the two areas jurisdictions have identified as being most interested in hearing about from other jurisdictions (p. 17, Table 15).
9. Feedback to Alberta Learning (at the end of the interview) produced a number of suggestions for improving the accountability and more general relationships between the Ministry and jurisdictions. Opportunities for meaningful dialogue appear to be rich (p. 19, Table 16).
10. Jurisdictions' responses revealed a strong support for the revised Three Year Education Plan (3YEP) review process (p. 22, Table 17).

INTRODUCTION

Alberta Learning reads and summarizes school jurisdiction education plans to support continuous improvement in the K-12 learning system, as one way of being informed about key issues identified by school boards as affecting the K-12 education system, and to reinforce the accountability relationship between Ministry and school board planning in support of systemic continuous improvement. This report is part of a series of summary reports on school board planning that over time document the operation and evolution of the strategic planning aspects of the Alberta model of accountability for basic education. The primary audiences for this report are school and system based administrators, school board trustees, and Alberta Learning's Executive Team and managers, but the document is also a component in the public reporting aspect of the accountability model for basic education.

METHODOLOGY AND LIMITATIONS

The methods used in analyzing school board education plans involve Alberta Learning staff creating a Summary and Review form for jurisdiction plans. This form is unique for each planning cycle to capture local planning contexts in relationship to the current *Guide for School Board Planning and Results Reporting*. Field Services staff read each education plan, highlighting key aspects in a Summary and Review Form. These forms are then reviewed and verified through meetings with superintendents by Field Services managers. The System Improvement and Reporting Division then completes both quantitative and qualitative content-analysis of the verified Summary and Review Forms noting key patterns and insights for the planning process. These findings are summarized in this report that rolls up this information for the 62 operating school board 2003-2006 education plans.

Frequencies in this report represent either a percent of a predetermined total (e.g. percent of jurisdictions including a specific outcome or measure in their plans) or responses to open-ended questions. Open-ended response frequencies (e.g. see Table 3 or 4) represent input volunteered by jurisdiction staff in response to a general question as opposed to selecting items from a pre-designed list of possible responses. In these cases the numbers and percentages reported should be interpreted as generally illustrative of the relative importance of the items and not reflective of a scientific survey of ranked importance of the item(s).

EDUCATION PLAN REQUIREMENTS

Part A of the review template contains a list of required elements for the 2003-2006 School Board Education Plans. Jurisdiction Three-Year Education Plans were evaluated to determine which requirements were included. The following section highlights those education plan requirements and Table 1 identifies those that departed substantially (greater than 5%) from full compliance. Of 55 required elements, jurisdiction compliance was 100% for 21 measures or strategies; compliance of 26 of the measures and strategies fell between 95% and 100%; however, 8 requirements proved problematic, i.e. fell below the 95% cut-off. The problematic measures and strategies, highlighted in Table 1, have been adjusted if not applicable to individual jurisdictions. Some of these measures and strategies (e.g. the learning system is affordable and financial need is not a barrier) have subsequently been eliminated from the 2004-07 plan requirements. Others, for example ESL strategies and measures, require further attention.

Table 1 – Alberta Learning Requirements Most Frequently Not Included in Jurisdiction's Three-Year Education Plans **n (%)**

Communication of plan to parents and the public	58 (93.5%)
Goal 1: High quality learning opportunities for all	
Goal 1 outcomes	
Financial need is not a barrier to learners participating in learning opportunities—Strategy	58 (93.5%)
Financial need is not a barrier to learners participating in learning opportunities—Measure	58 (93.5%)
Goal 2: Excellence in Learner Outcomes	
Goal 2 outcomes	
Learners demonstrate high standards—Measure	57 (91.9%)
Priority Areas for Improvement	
Priority Areas Outcomes	
English as a Second Language—Strategy	54 (87.1%)
Other	
Highlights of School Facilities Plans	
Educational purposes of the projects and benefits to students	52 (83.9%)
Where and how the reader can get more detailed information	58 (93.5%)
School planning that includes provincial and local goals, strategies, measures and targets	57 (91.9%)

One key purpose of the accountability framework for basic learning is to ensure a degree of alignment between Alberta Learning's Business Plan and school jurisdiction education plans. Consequently, the number and percentage of planning requirements in each board's 2003-2006 3YEP were tabulated and are summarized in the following table (Table 2). For some boards not all measures and strategies apply (e.g. have very low or nil numbers of FNMI and/or ESL students), therefore, the maximum number of required measures/strategies may be between 50 and 55[1]. Where this is the case, the base number is less than 55 and the percentage has been adjusted to reflect the adjusted base value. The adjusted average percent of alignment with the overall requirements for jurisdiction 2003-06 education plans is 97.68% with a standard deviation of 3.49%.

[1] See Appendix 1 for a comprehensive list of required measures/ strategies.

*Table 2 – Total Accountability Performance Measures Reported by Jurisdiction**

ZONE	Jurisdictions	Total Score Max=55	ZONE	Jurisdictions	Total Score Max=55	ZONE	Jurisdictions	Total Score Max=55
1	Fort Vermilion	54/55 98%	2/3	St. Albert Protestant	50/52 96%	5	Christ the Redeemer	55/55 100%
1	Peace River	54/55 98%	2.3	St. Paul	53/55 96%	5	Foothills	55/55 100%
1	Northland	54/55 98%	2/3	Elk Island Public	53/53 100%	5	Prairie Land	52/52 100%
1	Holy Family Catholic	54/55 98%	2/3	Evergreen Catholic	51/52 98%	5	Golden Hills	55/55 100%
1	High Prairie	46/55 84%	2/3	Lakeland Catholic	49/54 91%	5	Rocky View	55/55 100%
1	Grand Prairie Catholic	54/55 98%	2/3	Living Waters	53/54 98%	6	Medicine Hat Catholic	54/54 100%
1	Grande Prairie Public	54/55 98%	2/3	Northern Gateway	51/55 93%	6	Medicine Hat Public	55/55 100%
1	Peace Wapiti	54/55 98%	2/3	St. Thomas Aquinas	54/54 100%	6	Palliser	55/55 100%
2/3	Elk Island Catholic	50/52 96%	2/3	Sturgeon	55/55 100%	6	Prairie Rose	55/55 100%
2/3	Black Gold	49/51 96%	2/3	Wetaskiwin	55/55 100%	6	Westwind	55/55 100%
2/3	Buffalo Trial	52/52 100%	2/3	Northern Lights	51/54 94%	6	Grasslands	55/55 100%
2/3	East Central AB Catholic	53/55 96%	4	Battle River	55/55 100%	6	Holy Spirit	55/55 100%
2/3	Edmonton Catholic	54/55 98%	4	Chinook's Edge	55/55 100%	6	Horizon	54/54 100%
2/3	Edmonton Public	52/55 95%	4	Clearview	55/55 100%	6	Lethbridge Public	55/55 100%
2/3	Aspen View	54/54 100%	4	Red Deer Public	54/55 98%	6	Livingstone Range	55/55 100%
2/3	Fort McMurray Catholic	54/55 98%	4	Red Deer Catholic	54/55 98%	F	Central East	48/52 92%
2/3	Fort McMurray Public.	53/55 96%	4	Wild Rose	55/55 100%	F	Southern Public	44/50 88%
2/3	Grande Yellowhead	53/55 96%	4	Wolf Creek	55/55 100%	F	Gr. Southern Catholic	47/52 90%
2/3	Gr. St. Albert Catholic	55/55 100%	5	Canadian Rockies	48/54 89%	F	Northwest	52/52 100%
2/3	Parkland	54/55 98%	5	Calgary Catholic	55/55 100%	F	Central North	48/52 92%
2/3	Pembina Hills	51/51 100%	5	Calgary Public	55/55 100%			

* Total measures calculation excludes reporting on local goals and "other" Priority Areas for Improvement. Some jurisdictions indicated strategies/measures (e.g. for FNMI and/or ESL) are not applicable to them and if this is the case, the percentages have been adjusted to reflect this.

Local Priorities for Improvement

An opportunity was given for jurisdictions to comment on local priorities for improvement. While most districts related their local priorities to a provincial goal, a few identified more specific priorities for the district including the following:

- Alternate delivery of educational opportunities to enhance student learning (i.e. online delivery of high school programs and differentiated instructions).
- Strengthen Board and teacher relationships.
- Enhance and support Catholicity or faith development
- Retrofit of schools to reduce energy costs.
- High standards of citizenship, conduct, safety, and well-being of student and staff.
- Student leadership development
- Increasing enrolment of foreign students.
- Building partnerships within the school and community.
- Completing a system-wide crisis response plan.

PLAN DEVELOPMENT AND COMMUNICATION PROCESSES

Plan Development

Jurisdictions were asked both to describe the process used to develop the 3YEP and to describe the plan for communicating the 3YEP to parents and the public.

Some key observations relating to Plan Development included:

- Multiple processes and inputs underlie the planning process (see Table 3 for a summary—the listed categories are not mutually exclusive).
- All jurisdictions reported using a collaborative process/processes (see Table 4).
- Administrators and Board members were most commonly referred to as being key to the development of the 3YEP.
- Three key categories of information were used to inform the process of developing the 3YEP:
  1. The previous year's results reports and plans at both the school and jurisdiction level.
  2. Achievement data including Provincial Achievement Tests, Diploma Exams, and school-generated data.
  3. Survey results.

Table 3 - Process Used to Develop the 3YEP

Process
Develop goals/outcomes/targets/priorities
Consultations/meetings/discussions
Receive input/feedback
Hold a retreat
Review by committee/subcommittee
Hold workshops
Gather information

Table 4 - People Involved in Developing the 3YEP

People/groups	
Administrators	Central Office Staff
Board	Joint School Councils
Parents	Schools
School Councils	Facilitator
Stakeholders	Alberta Learning Rep
Teachers	Parish (Priests)
Trustees	School Council Chairs
School Principals	Division principal
Superintendents	Leadership Team
Support Staff	Executive Team
Community Members	Division staff
Students	Directors

Communication Process

Overall, jurisdictions communicate their 3YEPs in similar ways, with jurisdiction websites being the most common communicative medium (79%). Communication methods are highlighted in Table 5.

Table 5 - Planned Method of Communicating Jurisdictions' 3YEP

Communicative Medium	Number of Jurisdictions (%)
Website	49 (79%)
School Council	36 (58%)
Hard copies available in Schools	18 (29%)
Newsletter	15 (24%)
Media	13 (21%)
Public Board meeting	12 (19%)
Hard copies in Central Office	6 (10%)

In addition to the above, many jurisdictions indicated that copies of the 3YEP are sent directly to various stakeholders, including:

- the parish
- other jurisdictions
- corporate board
- each principal
- superintendents of surrounding districts and large urban jurisdictions
- parent councils
- MLAs
- day cares
- other educational institutions
- business partners
- community leaders
- ward chairs
- Alberta Learning
- the city
- ATA and CUPE presidents

JURISDICTION TRENDS AND ISSUES

Jurisdictions were asked to describe the primary trends and issues the jurisdiction is facing in the next three years and to review the plans to address these. Responses highlighted the diverse nature of the jurisdictions and the unique challenges faced by each of them. Common concerns of jurisdictions are highlighted below.

- Funding and budgeting issues were identified by 40% of jurisdictions. Many cite high infrastructure costs as problematic.
- Enhancement and delivery of programs and services to special needs students was cited as a concern by 34%. A few also specified that the identification and coding of special needs students is an issue that needs to be addressed.
- Technology concerns were raised by 31% regarding the cost of acquiring and maintaining technology, the training of staff in specialized technology use, and the lack of technology infrastructure, among others.
- Decreasing enrolment is a concern commonly expressed, especially by rural jurisdictions. This "trend to urbanization" has left some jurisdictions' facilities under-utilized while others are overburdened. Many jurisdictions find it a struggle to provide high-quality, full programming to small (often rural) schools.

Though not exhaustive, Table 6 summarizes common trends and issues identified by jurisdictions.

Table 6 - Primary Trends and Issues

Issues and Trends	**Number of Jurisdictions (%)**
Funding and budgeting	25 (40%)
Programs and services for special needs students	21 (34%)
Technology	19 (31%)
School facilities	14 (23%)
Decreasing enrollment	11 (18%)
Trend to urbanization	10 (16%)
Student achievement (especially in math)	10 (16%)
How to provide full programming to small schools	9 (15%)
Staff turnover and recruitment	9 (15%)
Programming to increase FNMI success	9 (15%)
Professional development for teachers	8 (13%)
High School completion rates	8 (13%)
Increasing number of students requiring ESL	7 (11%)
Growth in the area	7 (11%)
High infrastructure costs	7 (11%)
Transportation of students	7 (11%)
Increase in class sizes	6 (10%)
AISI and developing a professional learning community	5 (8%)
Increase in the number of FNMI students	5 (8%)
Identification and coding of special needs students	4 (6%)
Reality of implementing the Commission's work	4 (6%)

- Several jurisdictions shared their plans to address these trends and issues; some of the more unique included:
- Obtaining a line of credit to assist with cash flow.
- Transfer of buildings from another jurisdiction to deal with increased enrollment.
- Project with Sun Microsystems to address the issue of technology cost.
- "ESL Centres of Excellence".
- Rigorous identification and tracking of FNMI students.
- Expand and advocate enhanced speech and language services for students in the pre-school special needs program.
- Communicate with people without school-aged children to emphasize the need to support schooling.

JURISDICTION STRENGTHS AND CHALLENGES

The jurisdictions were asked to comment on their areas of strength as well as areas needing improvement according to the following major topics: *Provincial Achievement Test (PAT)/Diploma results; Special Education Profile; Multiple Year High and/or Low Performing Schools; First Nations, Metis and Inuit Policy Framework (FNMI) Data; High School Completion Data; Alberta Initiative for School Improvement (AISI) Information; School Budget Report Forms (BRF) and Annual Financial Plan (AFP); and Major School Renewal and Construction Projects (Facility Plan).* Their responses are presented in Tables 7 through 12 and are summarized on the pages that follow.

PAT/Diploma Examination Results

Not all jurisdictions answered the aforementioned question directly. Some of them focused on the processes, such as analysis of results and cooperative dialogues between the parties involved (i.e., superintendents, principals, trustees, etc.), rather than indicating specific areas of strength or need. Nineteen percent (19%) of jurisdictions focused on *both* "pockets of strengths and weaknesses," 21% touched upon their strengths only and 18% mentioned only needs or areas for improvement.

Areas of Strength: Twenty one percent (21%) of jurisdictions referred to their results in PATs and Diploma Exams as satisfactory and solid and 6% stressed high participation rates achieved (Table 7). In some instances generally good results were "flawed" by relatively weak student achievement in specific grade(s) or subject(s) (see *Areas needing improvement* on the following page). In addition, an assortment of "other" areas of strength was mentioned by 21% of jurisdictions in relation to student achievement (Table 7).

Table 7 – Provincial Achievement Test/Diploma Exam Results

Areas of Strength	n (%)	Areas Needing Improvement	n (%)
• Overall solid achievement results, including strong PAT and DE results (maintained and/or improved)	13 (21%)	• Need to improve student achievement overall	5 (8%)
		• Specifically need to improve:	
		- grade 9 mathematics	8 (13%)
• High participation rates in achievement tests	4 (6%)	- junior high achievement test results, including math, science and social studies	6 (10%)
• Other related areas of strength mentioned, including: - effective partnerships with various stakeholders; - improved/innovative/ diversified programming, including on-line learning; - ICT integration, including using technology in the curriculum; and - teacher PD targeting student achievement	13 (21%)	• Other areas for improvement mentioned, including: - improve the percentage of students who meet the standard of excellence; - address the issues of teaching of, achievement in and discipline in math; - address performance of French Immersion students on PATs; - improve programming and instruction; - review PAT and DE targets if they do not provide "the stretch in student learning that the jurisdiction wants to achieve;" - use evidence-based approach to establishing targets; and - address cuts in SHIP services due to lack of funding.	9 (15%)

Acronyms used in the table: PAT – Provincial Achievement Test; DE – Diploma Exam; PD – professional development; SHIP – Student Health Initiative Program; ICT – Information and Communication Technology.

Areas needing improvement: While a relatively small proportion of jurisdictions (8%) pointed out the need to improve student achievement in general, (21%) of them accentuated the need for improvement in junior high grades and especially in grade 9 mathematics (Table 7). There is an indication that provincial test results and standards are an important benchmark for some jurisdictions when they evaluate their results. Several jurisdictions shared their strategies for improving the results, including:

- using ATRAC (student assessment tracking tool) profiles to analyze results and improve delivery of programming;
- conducting ongoing school evaluations and focusing on school improvement;
- providing sessions to teachers on how to align curriculum, classroom resources and teaching methodology to enhance student achievement;
- creating Professional Learning Communities;
- undertaking a mathematics review at all grade levels;
- introducing math literacy;
- employing a math action team "to enhance delivery skills;"
- developing "vertical teams" of math teachers;
- having grade 9 and 10 math teachers collaborating in education planning;
- developing AISI projects to enhance math results, including a lead teacher to analyze the results with staff;
- launching the Math Program Development Initiative focusing on student performance and achievement;
- increasing minutes of instruction in math; and
- launching the mentorship program for students at risk.

Special Education Profile

In all, 32 (52%) jurisdictions commented on the special education profile.

Areas of strength: Seventeen jurisdictions (27%) expressed satisfaction with their current special education profiles (Table 8) and the ability to respond to student, parent and community needs. Ten percent (10%) stressed having special education plans and programs (including Individual Program Plans [IPP]) in place or under development. At the same time, a number of jurisdictions pointed out the need to review the special education profiles (see below).

Table 8 – Special Education Profile

Areas of Strength	n (%)	Issues/Areas Needing Improvement	n (%)
• Special needs profile is generally strong and working well/improving	17 (27%)	• Funding	9 (15%)
• Alternative programming, including IPP is available/being developed	6 (10%)	• Special education profiles need adjustments	6 (10%)

Areas needing improvement: Different aspects of funding were identified as an area of need/concern by 15% of jurisdictions. Specific issues mentioned were: (1) current profile matches incidence levels, but funds are not totally covering the cost of programs and supports; (2) incidents of special needs students and resultant costs exceed the original profile determination; (3) existing student needs are complex and service costs are increasing (e.g., assessment and programming); (4) Program Unit Funding (PUF) provides higher levels of funding for boards when children are in ECS than when the students enter grade one, but families expect the same level of services; and (5) "mildly disabled" and gifted students need to be funded separately. Ten percent (10%) of the respondents advocated adjustment of special education profiles in order to account for increases in the number of special needs students in some of the jurisdictions/schools (e.g., "due to foster placements"). They also called attention to the difficulties of capturing, assessing and programming for transient students and additional challenges in serving dispersed/rural student populations (e.g., an issue of clustering students with severe special needs to provide quality and cost efficient services).

Multiple Year High and/or Low Performing Schools

Nineteen jurisdictions (31%) mentioned different aspects of dealing with school performance. The bulk of the comments concerned the *processes* of monitoring schools and identifying which of them require "focused support" rather than specifying concrete areas of strength or need. As illustrated in Table 9, the majority of jurisdictions who commented on the topic (21%) emphasized conducting regular analyses (with school administration) of the schools' results to uncover anomalies and monitor consistent low performing schools. Ten percent (10%) stressed having school improvement plans in place.

Table 9 – Multiple Year High and/or Low Performing Schools	***n (%)***
• Regular review/analysis of results with school administration	13 (21%)
• Enacting professional development/in-service to improve student achievement and "address learning pressures" and an ongoing sharing of best practices	7 (11%)
• Having improvement plans in place and taking advantage of projects such as AISI and FNMI to address the school performance issues	6 (10%)

A number of jurisdictions (11%) accentuated the need to provide professional development to teachers and administrators including developing a jurisdiction-based "collaborative learning community" to stimulate ongoing collegial support and sharing successful strategies.

FNMI Data

While 3 jurisdictions indicated directly that the FNMI program is not applicable to them (due to very few First Nation people residing in the area), only 28 jurisdictions (45%) commented on the subject, including areas of strength and needs (Table 10).

Table 10 – FNMI Data

Areas of Strength	n (%)	Issues/Areas Needing Improvement	n (%)
• FNMI identification + ongoing assessment introduced	13 (21%)	• Issues with FNMI identification and gathering data on First Nation students	8 (13%)
• Basic supports are being put in place	8 (13%)	• Other issues/areas of need: - staffing and continuity of staff (including Aboriginal liaison workers and a FNMI coordinator) - low daily high school attendance by Aboriginal students and low high school completion rates - high transience of foster students; - need to increase the number of Aboriginal parents participating in school/jurisdiction governance; and - need to develop an appropriate planning and reporting mechanism for First Nation students.	8 (13%)
• Specific plans (for gathering the data, addressing needs of FNMI learners, improving programs, etc.) are being developed	4 (6%)		
• Other areas of strength: - Aboriginal Policy developed; - intake of FNMI students at early levels of schooling; - having strong associated programs (e.g., AISI, Outreach); and - partnering with other jurisdictions to capture/serve transient or dispersed student population and gather data.	6 (10%)		

Areas of strength: Identification of FNMI students provides baseline data for the project. Starting/continuing the identification process by adding a voluntary self-identifier question to registration forms was highlighted by 21% of the jurisdictions. The next most frequently mentioned strength (13%) was building supports imperative for FNMI success, such as hiring liaison workers "to assist students and schools," selecting appropriate project leaders who understand Aboriginal students' needs and establishing community links (e.g., with Native friendship centers, Aboriginal community groups, elders, parents, Aboriginal teachers, etc.).

Areas needing improvement: Thirteen percent (13%) of the jurisdictions reported having issues with FNMI identification and coming up with low numbers of eligible students as a result. There could be some reluctance on the part of families/students to reveal their ethnic background and off-reserve students are less likely to self-identify. An additional 13% of jurisdictions identified a variety of "other" areas of need (Table 10).

(Anticipated) benefits resulting from FNMI: Besides touching upon areas of strength and need, the jurisdictions articulated (expected) benefits from FNMI projects, such as increasing completion rates, rising academic achievement of the target population, and helping with attendance issues. An opinion was also expressed that "the FNMI framework gives a better sense of the areas of focus." The actual progress will be assessed upon further gathering and analyzing FNMI data.

High School Completion Data

In total, 38 or 61% of the jurisdictions commented on high school completion data.

Areas of strength: Twenty three percent (23%) of the jurisdictions reported having alternative programs and (early) intervention in place and some of them directly attributed increased completion rates to these programs (such as the Integrated Occupation Program [IOP], Outreach, home schooling, evening, weekend and summer programs, Registered Apprenticeship Program [RAP], Green Certificate, Career and Technology Services [CTS], Career Pathways, and so on). Ten percent (10%) laid emphasis on stretching their efforts to tracking students from grade 9 through graduation, following up students who do not complete high school, conducting exit interviews and surveying students to determine reasons for leaving school and to identify potential "leavers."

Table 11 – High School Completion Data

Areas of Strength	n (%)	Issues/Areas Needing Improvement	n (%)
• High school completion is either at a high/satisfactory level (3 and/or 5 year) or is making a progress	15 (24%)	• Need to improve results on high school completion	9 (15%)
• Alternative programs are available to assist with high school completion	14 (23%)		
• Data is being collected to uncover the reasons behind high school completion or dropping out	6 (10%)		

Areas needing improvement: Fifteen percent (15%) of the jurisdictions underscored the need to improve their high school completion rates. Six jurisdictions (10%) pointed out issues, which, in their opinion, would (negatively) affect high school completion data.

AISI Information

In all, 28 jurisdictions (45%) commented on their AISI projects. Only a small number of responses singled out specific "strengths" and "areas needing improvement," but comparable categories can be inferred from the answers.

Areas of strength: Eleven percent (11%) highlighted making adjustments to incorporate AISI in their 3-year education plans and reporting. A couple of the jurisdictions characterized their AISI information as "well developed" and "clearly outlined, project-by-project." Others mentioned using the results for initiatives such as sharing best practices and integrating them into ongoing education programs as well as for teachers' own research and improving instruction and practice. Consistent with the initial intent of the AISI, some jurisdictions view AISI funds as a "start-up" for projects that then become institutionalized or program-based.

Table 12 – AISI Information

Areas of Strength	n (%)	Focuses of AISI Projects	n (%)
• Incorporating AISI information into the three year education plan	7 (11%)	• Professional development component - building capacity of teachers and staff	6 (10%)
• Having productive/well-developed projects	5 (8%)	• Improving mathematics instruction at elementary, middle and high school	5 (8%)
		• Addressing programming needs and introducing new learning strategies	5 (8%)

Areas needing improvement bear similarity to the "focuses of AISI projects" outlined by the jurisdictions (Table 12). Various aspects of professional development were most frequently brought up, including building up Professional Learning Communities (PLC), some of which will involve teachers, parents, teacher assistants, principals and even students. Other focal points were improving mathematics instruction and addressing programming and instructional needs (e.g., through differentiated instruction).

School Board Budget Report Forms (BRF), Annual Financial Plan (AFP) and Major School Renewal and Construction Projects (Facility Plan)

In total, 29 jurisdictions (47%) commented on BRF/AFP and Facility Plans. Predominantly the comments concerned issues associated with facility pressures and planning relationships between jurisdictions, Alberta Learning and Infrastructure.

Areas of strength: Roughly a quarter of the jurisdictions (26%) conveyed a clear vision of their school renewal/construction projects (i.e., described their specific needs/approaches based on demographic situations and/or had the projects waiting for approval/set up/completed).

Areas needing improvement were pointed out by a relatively small number of jurisdictions and boiled down to two themes – an assortment of issues with school construction/renewal (5%) and financial issues (5%).

Highlights on Jurisdictions Strengths and Challenges

- Improving instruction and achievement in mathematics, especially at the middle and high school level, remains a focal point across the jurisdictions.

- Few jurisdictions commented specifically on *AISI information* (as was formulated in the question), particularly on how AISI data has been collected and reported and what were specific results, areas of strengths and issues. Collection of data resulting from AISI projects, and its incorporation in the jurisdictions' planning and reporting is an area that needs further clarification and development.

- FNMI student identification could be one of the major issues/constraints in the data gathering and evaluation.

ALBERTA LEARNING SUPPORTS

Virtually all jurisdictions (59 or 95%) provided input when asked the question: "How can Alberta Learning support the implementation of your education plan?" Such energetic response coupled with the diversity of topics put forward (Table 13) and overall positive tone of the feedback, attests to jurisdictions' interest in cooperation with the Ministry and further liaison development. Note: Jurisdictions raised issues and expressed opinions at their own discretion when answering the open-ended question, so the numbers/percentages indicate relative comparisons.

Table 13 – Desired Alberta Learning (AL) Supports in Education Plan Implementation n (%)

• Jurisdictions are satisfied with AL services (e.g., level and quality of support)	15 (24%)
• AL needs to share a broad spectrum of information and resources with jurisdictions	13 (21%)
• Maintain/further develop various avenues of dialog and cooperation with the jurisdictions	12 (19%)
• Particulars of the education plan preparation	12 (19%)
• Supports in curriculum and resource development	10 (16%)
• Various aspects of funding, including funding differentiation	7 (11%)
• Assistance with FNMI and Aboriginal education	6 (10%)
• Need for professional development in various areas	5 (8%)

Jurisdictions' satisfaction with Alberta Learning supports/services: Roughly a quarter of the jurisdictions (24%) underscored their satisfaction with Alberta Learning services, specifically with the timeliness of the Ministry's responses to inquiries and assistance with the education plans. Quality support from the Field Services was mentioned particularly frequently, including "speed and efficiency."

Maintaining/further developing various avenues of dialog and cooperation: Nineteen percent of the respondents (19%) stressed the importance of the liaison with the Ministry. The jurisdictions appreciated the opportunity to bring their concerns to the department. There was a high degree of concordance in opinion that Education Managers play a key role in this liaison. In addition, continuity in the relationship (i.e., with the same manager) would be appreciated.

Sharing information/resources with the jurisdictions: Jurisdictions (21%) put much emphasis on receiving timely data, information and research services from the Ministry that would support continuous improvement. Specific examples included the following:

- creating a clearinghouse to share/disseminate effective practices (such as effective practices for helping students learn mathematics and sharing information on Balanced Literacy);
- helping with assessment (e.g. through liaison with the Alberta Assessment Consortia);
- evaluating research information related to the implementation of the Middle School concept;
- setting clear expectations related to information provision (e.g., inclusion of Special Needs classes and IOP classes in class size survey data).

Particulars of the education plan preparation: Specific comments on the planning process (19%) included appreciation of "fewer, clearer goals;" less overlap in the last plan format; and desire for continued consultation and cooperation on setting provincial goals and providing results. There was a comment that the Performance Measures section of *The Guide to Education Plan and Annual Education Results Report* for the 3-year plan needs to be "more user-friendly" (i.e., clearer). In addition, explanations to the PAT requirements for the 3-year plan need more clarity. Lastly, there were requests to "tell the jurisdictions what is in the budget early" and "set the budget for 3 years."

Supports in curriculum and resource development were commented on by 16% of the jurisdictions. The suggestions included having more provincial support in curriculum implementation, keeping involvement of staff at the jurisdiction level at all stages of the process and providing more lead-time when it comes to new curriculum and resources. Some also suggested a sub-committee of Francophone superintendents that would consult with the Ministry on matters pertaining to the acquisition of suitable resources. Finally, the need was articulated for more coordinated help for implementing the Supernet.

Various aspects of funding: Among a variety of comments on the funding issues, there were propositions to adopt differentiated funding for technology and special education as well as provide additional funding for curriculum implementation.

Assistance with FNMI and Aboriginal education: The jurisdictions look forward to working with the Aboriginal Services Branch to continue making a difference for Aboriginal learners. They would like to share information on how jurisdictions with a minimal FNMI student population deal with FNMI education, be provided with the jurisdiction and school achievement and other data for FNMI students and see additional schools joining the project.

Need for professional development in various areas: The jurisdictions outlined a range of professional development needs, including in-services on target setting and improving the planning cycle, workshops in the areas of learner assessment, curriculum and special education, as well as advice, support and suggested resources for professional learning community development. The Ministry was encouraged to look at organizing provincial/Regional Consortia workshops on mathematics to enhance students' learning in elementary and junior high math (since grade 9 math "seems to be a provincial issue") and on developing "integrated units."

Highlights

- The response rate, overall positive tone of the feedback and a variety of proposed areas of cooperation suggest that the jurisdictions are interested in optimizing partnerships with the Ministry.
- Jurisdictions showed a great deal of interest in obtaining additional Ministry assistance with various sources of information, resources and research services.

EFFECTIVE PRACTICES AVAILABLE FOR SHARING

In response to the opportunity to review aspects of their plan that would be of interest to other jurisdictions, respondents from 30 jurisdictions identified 55 specific examples. Staff from an additional 16 jurisdictions expressed their enthusiasm more generally by offering to share any aspect of their plan, often noting its availability on the Internet. The specific responses, including the source jurisdiction, are summarized in Table 14.

Table 14 - Shared Aspects of Plan that Would Be of Interest to Other Jurisdictions

Fort Vermilion	• Use of results to make improvements • Results templates
Aspen View	• Efficient and effective budgeting procedures
East Central Catholic	• Percent of targets achieved
Edmonton Public	• The Focus on Instruction initiative
Elk Island Public	• Three year planning strategy
Fort McMurray	• FNMI student grad results • Early intervention programs
Lakeland Catholic	• Anti-Bullying initiative • Leadership academy to support administration • Special ed program for aboriginal students • Central Office Leadership Team to support school planning integral to district planning • Tech services supportive of ICT outcomes
Living Waters Catholic	• AISI projects • Faith Dev. Day process • Cooperation with other districts on transportation and school calendars • Special education testing and assessment practices • PD plan for administration focused on improving student learning
Northern Gateway	• Virtues program for students with focus on the fine arts
Northern Lights	• Literacy programming and PD practices
Parkland	• High school completion and the HumanaCare Wellness program • Covey 7 habits training
Pembina Hills	• Improvements in student achievement as a function of the education plan
St. Albert Protestant	• Mandatory math tutorials for students who do not do well on exams – improving math achievement
St. Paul	• AISI projects • Placing Accountability Upon a Student's Education Program • FNMI projects • Mennonite school
St. Thomas Aquinas	• Format of ed plan
Sturgeon	• Focus "framework" for student success • PD initiatives
Battle River	• Comprehensive education plan • Safe and Caring initiatives and bully proofing
Chinook's Edge	• Job embedded PD
Red Deer Public	• Linkage of priorities with goals in plan
Wetaskiwin	• How we have managed through regionalization • How we have continued to develop 3 year plans and be accountable
Wild Rose	• Implementation of Exploring Strategies for Teaching and Assessment PD for all teaching staff • The Manage Learning Network
Canadian Rockies	• Focus group approach to feedback – has replaced surveys
Christ the Redeemer	• Learning at Home Program
Rocky View	• Tech renewal plan • PD plan with effective working relationship ATA local
Medicine Hat Catholic	• Program choice for students in a relatively small jurisdiction • Turning Points program for special needs students

Livingstone Range	• PD on building staff capacity to meet student needs • Leadership development program • FNMI planning processes
Prairie Rose	• Districts work with religious and cultural groups • Parent involvement in AISI projects
Horizon	• Work with Mennonite community • Career and Technology Studies (CTS) kit development
Lethbridge	• Mentorship program for new teachers • Special Education Program Leadership
Palliser	• Visioning process

Highlights

- As evidenced in Table 14, jurisdictions' education plans are a rich resource for sharing innovative and effective practices.

EFFECTIVE PRACTICES WANTED

Jurisdiction staff were also asked if there were effective practices they would be interested in hearing about from other jurisdictions. Forty-two jurisdictions identified 57 specific areas in which they would like additional insight. These items were content analyzed and labeled according to what general category they best fit into. The categories applied included staff professional development needs, programs issues, and finance matters, with several sub-categories under the three general areas. The vast majority 34/57 or 60% dealt with program related needs, while 21/57 or 37% were staff-professional development needs, ten of which focused on PD needs associated with improving jurisdiction planning. Table 15 presents the breakdown of the categorized needs.

Table 15 - Effective Practices Jurisdictions Are Interested in Hearing About from Others

Category	Effective practices your jurisdiction would be interested in hearing about from other jurisdictions
Staff - PD - planning	1. Sessions of 3 year plan preparation and reporting layout
Staff - PD - planning	2. Relationship between school and jurisdiction planning
Staff - PD - planning	3. Helpful to see how our jurisdiction profile compares to others
Staff - PD - planning	4. Data gathering in zone 4
Staff - PD - planning	5. How other jurisdictions develop their three year plans and continuous improvement
Staff - PD - planning	6. A workbook-like strategy to assist principals with school budgeting
Staff - PD - planning	7. Processes to align school and jurisdiction plans.
Staff - PD - planning	8. Incorporating facilities plan into ed plan
Staff - PD - planning	9. Technology planning
Staff - PD - planning	10. How other jurisdictions prepare education plans.
Staff - PD	11. New administrator mentor programs
Staff - PD	12. Building professional learning communities
Staff - PD	13. Management of Credit Enrolment Units (CEUs) and Career and Technology Studies (CTS)
Staff - PD	14. Managing English as Second Language (ESL) demands
Staff - PD	15. High school completion improvement strategies

Staff - PD	16. Curriculum symposium is very useful
Staff - PD	17. Effective strategies for increasing high school completion rates and attendance across all grades
Staff - PD	18. Math improvement strategies
Staff - PD	19. On line policies that would help other jurisdictions
Staff - PD	20. Growth plan for administrators, Knowledge, Skills and Attitudes for administrators, faith component
Program - technology	21. Fort Vermillion technology projects should be duplicated across the North
Program - small schools	22. Programming in small high schools esp. those with large aboriginal populations
Program - small schools	23. Research on viability and effectiveness of small high schools
Program - religious	24. Religious program design and implementation in public districts
Program - reading	25. Early reading
Program - Outreach	26. Different Outreach models
Program - math	27. Numeracy
Program - literacy	28. Literacy
Program - literacy	29. Northern Lights literacy project
Program - literacy	30. Early literacy
Program - instruction	31. Learning suites as used in Fort Vermillion and Red Deer
Program - instruction	32. Any effective practice
Program - instruction	33. Any that will enhance student programs
Program - instruction	34. Strategies to improve % of H.S. students achieving at the excellent level
Program - instruction	35. College of Alberta Schools Superintendents (CASS) needs to develop mechanism to share effective practices
Program - instruction	36. Multi-stakeholder collaboration for sharing best practices
Program - instruction	37. Effective practices – via Alberta Learning
Program - instruction	38. Practices that improve student learning
Program - instruction	39. Learning communities and effective schools
Program - instruction	40. Alberta Learning should provide samples of effective processes, timelines and formats
Program - instruction	41. Middle school implementation research
Program - French Immersion	42. French Immersion strategies and program support
Program - ESL	43. Successful ESL instruction
Program - ESL	44. Provincial data/study of ESL enrollment trends and student needs and proficiency levels
Program - counseling	45. Pastoral counseling work
Program - completion	46. Improving high school completion rates
Program - completion	47. Effective practices in high school completion
Program - citizenship	48. Developing citizenship in students
Program - AISI	49. AISI clearing house
Program - aboriginal	50. Effective practices for aboriginal students
Program - aboriginal	51. Successful FNMI projects
Program - aboriginal	52. Programming opportunities for FNMI students
Program - aboriginal	53. Best practices, theory and research on FNMI projects
Program - aboriginal	54. FNMI
Finance	55. How is capital planning done in other jurisdictions? How are school locations best chosen?
Finance	56. Dealing with declining enrollments

Highlights

- Program implementation and professional development are the two areas that jurisdictions have identified as being most interested in hearing about from other jurisdictions.

FEEDBACK TO ALBERTA LEARNING

Towards the end of the interview, jurisdiction staff were asked if they had any final feedback for Alberta Learning. Forty-seven of 62 jurisdictions, or 76%, provided 75 specific suggestions or comments in response to this question. This input was content analyzed and patterns of responses were labeled to reflect the underlying common logic or issues represented. Six categories emerged including: Relationships, accountability, finance, Commission on Learning response, professional development and AISI.

Thirty-seven of the 77 items (or 49%) dealt with relationships, largely between jurisdictions and Alberta Learning, but also among government departments. Of these, 20 were comments or suggestions for improving the quality of the inter-organizational relationships, and 17 were positive comments reflecting satisfaction with the interaction with the department, largely mediated via Field Services. Eighteen of 21 comments on the accountability model reflected concerns with how accountability is being implemented or suggestions for improving the accountability model for basic education such as the place or function of provincial testing. The results of this content analysis are presented in Table 16.

Table 16 - Feedback to Alberta Learning

Category	Feedback to Alberta Learning
Accountability-	1. Concerns over diploma exam schedules.
Accountability-	2. Need more timely access to actual and current diploma exam data.
Accountability-	3. Difficulty levels of 3, 6 and 9 achievement tests seems to vary disproportionately.
Accountability-	4. Need direction on how to simplify our education plan.
Accountability-	5. Stick with the number of goals – changes cost the jurisdiction.
Accountability-	6. Separating sections of diploma exams has reduced instructional time.
Accountability-	7. Provincial and jurisdiction surveys need to be aligned better.
Accountability-	8. Need earlier budget information for plan.
Accountability-	9. Learner Assessment needs to meet deadlines with fewer corrections.
Accountability-	10. Require plans and reports in November.
Accountability-	11. Would like in-service on target setting and improving planning cycle.
Accountability-	12. Education plan requires excessive and growing amount or writing – keep it realistic.
Accountability-	13. Have a true three-year education planning cycle.
Accountability-	14. Provide better and more timely HS course completion information to central office.
Accountability-	15. Concern amount of PAT and DE data to be included is confusing to public.
Accountability-	16. Requirement to set targets for each year makes it a one year not a three year plan – change takes longer.
Accountability-	17. Caution re grad rates for home ed and on-line students.
Accountability-	18. Develop ESL proficiency levels.
Accountability+	19. Like the 3 goal format.
Accountability+	20. Current planning process works well.
Accountability+	21. Planning process helps get principals and teachers focused. We try to keep planning uncomplicated yet meaningful.
AISI	22. AISI renewal cycle is problematic.
COL response-	23. Review principals as members of ATA.
COL response-	24. Awaiting implementation of COL recommendations.
COL response-	25. Concerned recommendation of COL to exclude school admin from ATA would have very negative effect on the functioning of the district and would have negative impact on school org climate.
COL response+	26. Pleased with COL.

COL response+	27. Support COL.
Finance-	28. Calgary, Red Deer and Kananaskis meetings are expensive and/or inconvenient for northern districts to attend.
Finance-	29. Smaller districts need more money for admin.
Finance-	30. School buildings should be under AL.
Finance-	31. Declining enrollment and small class sizes are an issue – renewed funding framework very important.
Finance-	32. High levels of teacher qualifications are very costly to district as is tech and op costs.
Finance-	33. Health authority funding has been declining with result of fewer services and supports. Negative impact on early detection and follow-up.
PD+	34. Consider a provincial organization for student services personnel.
Relationships-	35. Email messages from AL have shifted of late from diplomatic to rude.
Relationships-	36. Alberta Learning and infrastructure need to work more closely together.
Relationships-	37. Alberta Learning needs better communication and collaboration and working relationships with people at the grass roots level.
Relationships-	38. More assistance as opposed to monitoring would be seen as advantageous.
Relationships-	39. Districts to be more involved in consultative process.
Relationships-	40. Keep communication lines open – more informal meetings with liaison manager. 41. Provide branch descriptions.
Relationships-	42. Very little trust and true collaboration between AL and jurisdictions.
Relationships-	43. Excessive demands on school administration consume valuable time from other ed matters.
Relationships-	44. Information collection by AL is taxing capacity of jurisdictions.
Relationships-	45. Concerned with lack of support from Children's Services when reporting issues of neglect.
Relationships-	46. Charter school process with AL is not collaborative.
Relationships-	47. Would like continuity with liaison manager.
Relationships-	48. AL should be instrumental in improving relationships with stakeholders in the ed community.
Relationships-	49. SHIP funding problematic – boundary changes extensive.
Relationships-	50. Work with Federal departments to deliver ed to Aboriginal students. 51. Work with us to implement the renewed funding framework.
Relationships-	52. More program support personnel from AL are needed by small districts.
Relationships-	53. Level of monitoring by AL is excessive – too much auditing – not everything good in schools can be scored.
Relationships-	54. Provide assistance in interpreting information AL provides.
Relationships-	55. Concern AL does not use collaboration when it is most needed. Greater involvement gets better buy in.
Relationships-	56. Concern about declining levels of collaboration (e.g. Diploma exams).
Relationships+	57. Appreciate AL involvement at CASS meetings and liaison manager support.
Relationships+	58. Continue the service you have been providing.
Relationships+	59. AL contacts are helpful and responsive.
Relationships+	60. Relationship with AL is valued and strong.
Relationships+	61. Keep up excellent work – zone managers are excellent resources and valued partners.
Relationships+	62. Continue great working relationship with AL contacts.
Relationships+	63. Value relationships with AL contacts.
Relationships+	64. Enjoyed electronic sharing, advice and visits.
Relationships+	65. Calgary office is appreciated for its assistance and understanding of local issues 66. Inefficient when calls are routed via Edmonton.
Relationships+	67. Appreciation for supports from Field Services. 68. Services and resources from Special Programs and Learning Technologies Branch (LTB) are also appreciated.
Relationships+	69. Collaborative process with AL re the 3-year plan review is excellent. Opportunity for greater exchange of information and ideas.

Relationships+	70. Appreciate advice.
Relationships+	71. Thanks for help and support. 72. Appreciate opportunities in curriculum development, exams and policy development.
Relationships+	73. Appreciate personal visit of AL and FNMI. Opportunity to discuss plan was beneficial.
Relationships+	74. Appreciates the personal visit to review the plan.
Relationships+	75. Appreciate email updates from DM and support from Field Services.
Relationships+	76. French Language Services Branch (FLSB) and AL treat all school jurisdictions in an equitable, fair and equal manner, even within francophone authorities.
Relationships+	77. FLSB is very much appreciated and indispensable to our needs.

Highlights

- Calls for "final" feedback to Alberta Learning (at the end of the interview) have produced a useful set of suggestions for improving the accountability and more general relationships between the Ministry and jurisdictions. Opportunities for meaningful dialogue appear to be rich.

FEEDBACK ON REVISED REVIEW PROCESS

Lastly, the jurisdictions were asked to share their thoughts about the revised Three-year Education Plan (3 YEP) review process. Fifty-four (87%) of the jurisdictions provided feedback on this question and several themes emerged as a result (Table 17).

Table 17 – Feedback on the Revised 3 YEP Process ***n (%)***

• **The new, revised process is appreciated/is better than before, because:**	**42 (68%)**
- It provides the opportunity for (a lot of) dialogue with and feedback from Alberta Learning	15 (24%)
- It encourages valid (personal) support from Alberta Learning staff	9 (15%)
- It is more user-friendly (e.g., the new templates/forms) and time-efficient than before	9 (15%)
- It reinforces linkages within the planning and reporting process	7 (11%)
- It makes it possible for the jurisdictions to get questions/templates ahead of time and have a draft of the plan reviewed prior to the submission	6 (10%)
• **Suggestions for further improvement**	**9 (15%)**
• **Concerns/Challenges**	**5 (8%)**
• **The process makes no difference**	**3 (5%)**

The revised plan review process is appreciated: There was an overwhelming support of the new review process. Almost two thirds of the jurisdictions (68%) indicated that they support the new process, which, according to them, was better, useful, more efficient and specific, very interesting, comprehensive, etc. Specifically (Table 17), the jurisdictions made a note that the new format encourages a two-way dialogue and discussion with the Ministry staff and they were appreciative of the feedback. The respondents felt supported, appreciated visits from the Ministry representatives and the "collegial and cooperative manner" in which the support was provided. According to the jurisdictions, the revised process was clear, had a reduced number of steps and goals and, consequently, was time-efficient.

Suggestions for further improvement: A number of jurisdictions (15%) had suggestions for further improvement of the plan review process, including:

- addition of an accountability template;
- having the template posted on the web site, similar to PUF, IPP, or capital plan submissions, so that information can be added on an incremental basis;
- including the 3 YEP checklist in the *Guide to the Education Plan and Annual Education Results Report*; and
- having the template received prior to the development of the Three Year Education Plan.

Concerns/Challenges: A limited number of the respondents (8%) expressed concerns, such as the need to process and report on "an incredible amount of information," having the large number of changes each year both in goals and target setting and the new process being too prescriptive.

Highlights

- Jurisdictions' responses revealed a strong support for the revised Three Year Education Plan review process.

Appendix 1

The fifty-five 2003-2006 Education Plan requirements are as follows:

1. Communication of plan to parents and the public.
2. The learning system meets the needs of all learners, society, and the economy. At least one strategy for this outcome.
3. The learning system meets the needs of all learners, society, and the economy. At least one measure for this outcome
4. All Albertans can participate in quality learning. At least one strategy for this outcome
5. All Albertans can participate in quality learning. At least one measure for this outcome
6. The Learning System is affordable. At least one strategy for this outcome
7. The Learning System is affordable. At least one measure for this outcome
8. Financial need is not a barrier to learners participating in learning opportunities. At least one strategy for this outcome
9. Financial need is not a barrier to learners participating in learning opportunities. At least one measure for this outcome
10. Learners demonstrate high standards. At least one strategy for this outcome
11. Learners demonstrate high standards. At least one measure for this outcome
12. Learners complete programs. At least one strategy for this outcome
13. Learners complete programs. At least one measure for this outcome
14. Learners are well prepared for lifelong learning. At least one strategy for this outcome
15. Learners are well prepared for lifelong learning. At least one measure for this outcome
16. Learners are well prepared for employment. At least one strategy for this outcome
17. Learners are well prepared for employment. At least one measure for this outcome
18. Learners are well prepared for citizenship. At least one strategy for this outcome
19. Learners are well prepared for citizenship. At least one measure for this outcome
20. Improved results through effective working relationships with partners and stakeholders. At least one strategy for this outcome
21. Improved results through effective working relationships with partners and stakeholders. At least one measure for this outcome
22. The jurisdiction demonstrates leadership and continuous improvement. At least one strategy for this outcome
23. The jurisdiction demonstrates leadership and continuous improvement. At least one measure for this outcome
24. Improving early literacy and numeracy. At least one strategy
25. Improving early literacy and numeracy. At least one measure
26. Improving children's access to services through co-ordination of services (clarified). At least one strategy
27. Improving children's access to services through co-ordination of services (clarified). At least one measure
28. Improving learning through effective use of information and communication technology. At least one strategy
29. Improving learning through effective use of information and communication technology. At least one measure

30. Improving programs, results and reporting for First Nations, Metis and Inuit learners (new). At least one strategy
31. Improving programs, results and reporting for First Nations, Metis and Inuit learners (new). At least one measure
32. Improving secondary student achievement in mathematics. At least one strategy
33. Improving secondary student achievement in mathematics. At least one measure
34. Increasing high school completion rates. At least one strategy
35. Increasing high school completion rates. At least one measure
36. Improving community satisfaction with education. At least one strategy
37. Improving community satisfaction with education. At least one measure

Note: Include strategies that reflect the implementation of the following programs and initiatives to align with the goals and Priority Areas for Improvement Sections as listed above.

38. AISI
39. Technology plans including ICT
40. Student Health
41. Early Literacy
42. English as a second language - if applicable
43. Programs and services for students with special needs
44. FNMI - if applicable

Performance Measures and Targets (page 7, Link 5)

45. Percentages of students who achieved the acceptable standard and the percentages who achieved the standard of excellence on provincial achievement tests, based both on those writing and all students in grade (cohort), **including targets for each year of the plan and results for five years.** (Note - Sci. 9 targets to be set when more years of data are available due to Curr. Revision in 2003-04 - see p. 7 - AL 2003-06 Business Plan)

46. Percentages of students who achieved the acceptable standard and the standard of excellence on diploma exams **and results for five years** no targets required.

47. Student participation in diploma exam courses -- **no target required.**

48. Percentage of students who completed high school within three and five years of entering grade 10, **including target for 2003/04 for the five-year completion rate.**

Highlights of School Facilities Plans (page 8)

49. Educational purposes of the projects and benefits to students
50. Reflect the jurisdiction's BQRP priorities and three-year capital plan
51. Where and how the reader can get more detailed information

Budget Highlights (page 8) including:

52. Public information about financial information for the upcoming year
53. Information from the Budget Report for parent and community members in charts or tables
54. Where and how the reader can get more detailed information

55. School planning that includes provincial and local goals, strategies, measures and targets (Link 6).